

WASHINGTON STATE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH FOUNDATIONAL PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICES MEETING

Meeting seven of the Foundational Public Health Services Policy Workgroup took place on October 15, 2014 at the Port of Chelan Confluence Technology Center in Wenatchee, Washington from 9:30am to 3:30pm.

WELCOME

Fauna Larkin of BERK welcomed everyone to the meeting, and reviewed the focus and agenda of the meeting. She explained that the meeting will focus on the language of the Draft Finding and Vision document, and that the communication and messaging will be left until the next meeting. John Wiesman welcomed everyone and asked everyone on the phone and at the meeting to be fully present and engaged with the discussion. John also discussed his speech and participation at the Washington State Public Health Association Conference. John explained some of the important points to be discussed in meeting seven of the FPHS work group meeting - ways to share resources, recommendations on funding, and state and local distribution.

Marilyn Scott welcomed everyone. She stated that she also attended the Public Health Association conference, and presented what the FPHS policy work group is working on with Barry Kling, Todd Mielke and Jennifer Tebaldi. She stressed the importance of the Vision Statements in the document. Todd thanked everyone for sticking through the process. Additionally, Todd suggested that if there is something a work group member is not happy with, he or she should try to think of a solution. He also stressed that communication is a very important piece of the process.

GROUP DISCUSSION - DRAFT FINDING & VISION DOCUMENT

Workgroup members raised discussion points about the Draft Finding and Vision document.

David Windom stated that having the state DOH fund FPHS is a non-starter because certain local public health boards would stop local funding for LHJs.

Fauna explained that after the different alternatives were suggested at one of the past workgroup meetings, the majority of the workgroup were interested in the alternative in where the state funds FPHS. Other alternatives were not suggested. Fauna explained that during this past meeting, those opposed to DOH funding FPHS, did not offer new ideas or suggestions.

Todd proposed a clarification and suggested that there were two ways to look at this discussion: if the state puts money into FPHS, does that money go to DOH and then the LHJs, or does the money go to the LHJs directly? Todd pointed out that it was important to focus on looking at the long term goal, and recognize that there will be phases to get to the long-term goal. A few additional aspects to look at included the political reality, how the local role of funding will work, and the participants in the process.

GALLERY WALK - SMALL GROUP DISCUSSION

The first round of gallery walk stations included the Findings, Vision, and Definitions. The information in these sections has been discussed by the FPHS policy workgroup multiple times. The next round of stations included Tribal Funding, State Funding, and Local Funding. Some of the statements in the second round of sections have been discussed, and other statements were drafted for this Gallery Walk. Fauna asked the

workgroup members to respond to these statements. This is the first take on these sections, and BERK drafted some statements in order for the workgroup members to respond. Fauna asked the workgroup members to provide extensive feedback on all the sections.

During the Gallery Walk, extensive editing was made to the different sections of the Draft Findings and Vision Statement document. The edited version of the document including the Findings, Vision, Definitions, Tribal Funding, State Funding, and Local Funding sections will be sent out with this meeting summary. The group discussion that followed the Gallery Walk is summarized through the rest of the document.

REPORT OUTS

Fauna asked the facilitators to present the main points of what was discussed during the Gallery Walk. Fauna's small group discussion with the workgroup members on the phone are also included in these report outs.

Findings

Claire Miccio of BERK presented what was discussed during the Finding section of the Gallery Walk. Important decisions the FPHS policy workgroup needs to make include: the use of "non FPHS" versus "AIS"; the use of "government system" versus "government network", and "basic" versus "foundational." Workgroup members addressed that while it was important to determine efficiencies it was also important to keep local priorities and constraints in mind.

Framework

Marie Flake presented what was discussed during the Framework section of the Gallery Walk. Important issues included the following: changing "Washington residents" to "people in Washington"; using the same phrase of "basic and defined services" throughout the document; taking into consideration that some tribes do not have public health departments; adding a sentence that says tribal governments will serve as self-determined; changing "shall" to "should"; not using the word "will".

There were some concerns about FPHS and AIS that included the following: how to discuss the current AIS funding; the usefulness of the red box graphic showing FPHS; how to depict the two pieces of a whole better; a fear of setting FPHS up to not get the full funding; presenting the information in a way that says we cannot do AIS until FPHS is funded; some AIS is required by the RCW and WAC. John pointed out that this is an important conversation and that is why so many different types of people are involved.

Definitions

Emmy McConnell of BERK presented what was discussed during the Definitions section of the Gallery Walk. Important issues included the following: it would be good to structure the section better; making sure the document is clear about the public health structure and system; determining what should be in FPHS and if the criteria should be population based or mandated; the document itself does not yet look like a definitions document and it is not yet ready for outside consumption.

Tribal Role in Funding Public Health

Karen Jensen presented what was discussed during the Tribal Role in Funding Public Health section of the Gallery Walk. Important issues included the following: the FPHS policy workgroup does not know enough about tribal public health, and there is more work to be done to understand tribal public health; efficient delivery should include some partnering together; some tribes do not have treaties with the federal government; this discussion should be delegated to tribal representatives to discuss further.

State and Local Role in Funding Public Health

Emmy presented what was discussed during the State Role in Funding Public Health section of the Gallery Walk. The discussion continued to include the local role in funding public health as well. Important issues included the following: short-term opportunity around the marijuana tax; other realistic short-term opportunities; the role of cities in this discussion.

Specific issues related to the debate between state and local responsibility and control included: concern about the state being responsible for FPHS; some workgroup members felt it was important to continue to have funding from counties; however, it was brought up that there is inequality in how different counties spend per capita; whether the RCWs are specific or open to interpretation; whether the discussion should be funding 100% of FPHS or funding 100% of the gap; the point that even if supplantation occurs, there could overall be more funding for public health.

Specific issues related to the AIS included: concern about the money for AIS diminishing; what the FPHS policy workgroup wants to say about AIS being funded in the future; the potential of a dedicated funding source for AIS; that AIS cannot work properly without completely funding FPHS.

CO-CHAIR CLOSING REMARKS

Todd stated that he expected some fast paced agendas for the remaining meetings. Marilyn responded that she appreciated the openness and participation of everyone on the phone and those that attended in person. She explained that it is very understandable that there are differences and the workgroup will plan to come to a consensus, as that is the goal for everyone.

John stated that it was important to have these crucial conversations, and that is why the state associations, local public health representatives and elected officials are all together in this policy workgroup. The workgroup will need to determine the issues and concerns that are difficult to work with, and find solutions to address them. John thanked everyone for staying engaged and following through.

NEXT STEPS

The next meeting will be on November 14th, 2014 from 9:30am to 3:30pm at the Museum of Flight in Tukwila. At that meeting, BERK will bring forward some language about the state and local role in funding.